

This is a repository copy of *New perspectives on understanding nuclear societies*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/118452/>

---

**Conference or Workshop Item:**

Connelly, Stephen, Cotton, Matthew David orcid.org/0000-0002-8877-4822, Molyneux-Hodgson, Susan et al. (1 more author) (2013) New perspectives on understanding nuclear societies. In: The Conference on STS Perspectives on Energy, 04-05 Nov 2013, Universidade de Lisboa.

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs (CC BY-ND) licence. This licence allows for redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, as long as it is passed along unchanged and in whole, with credit to the original authors. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# Understanding 'nuclear societies'



Photo: World Nuclear Association

Stephen Connelly • Matthew Cotton  
Susan Molyneux-Hodgson • Matt Watson  
*University of Sheffield*

# Understanding 'nuclear societies'



Stephen Connelly • Matthew Cotton  
Susan Molyneux-Hodgson • Matt Watson  
*University of Sheffield*

# Understanding 'nuclear societies'



Photo: Federal Government of the United States

Stephen Connelly • Matthew Cotton  
Susan Molyneux-Hodgson • Matt Watson  
*University of Sheffield*



# Overview

- **Introduction to the 'Nuclear Societies' PhD programme (an experiment!)**
- **Summary of key ideas informing the work**
- **The individual projects**
- **Ways of working: multi-disciplinarity and networks**
- **Questions...**

# The 'Nuclear Societies' programme

- Funding from UK ESRC for 3 x PhD scholarships
- to create a cohort of social science students to engage with a cohort of nuclear engineering students

## The Vision

- ❖ to create a community of researchers – regardless of disciplinary background – capable of engaging with future research agenda relating to nuclear energy in society
- ❖ to shape the 'nuclear societies' agenda and impact on engineering approaches to energy

# Key ideas 1: the policy context

- Energy security and climate change mitigation increasing as a matter of concern...  
...with 'nuclear' a partial solution: the 'nuclear renaissance'
- Competing technologies; complex of advocacies; policy and funding tensions; varied historical contexts  
→ wide range of technical, social, political challenges and...  
'nuclear power has been protected by an institutional web of social and technological practices...[which] engender a restricted scope for public discussion and democratic involvement within nuclear decision making' (Irwin et al., 2000: 83)  
→ need and challenges for critical social science?

# Why STS?


- **social and political issues at every scale involve sciences and technologies (nuclear... chemistry, engineering, hydrology, materials science, medicine, meteorology, mining, physics, radiation, transport...)**
- **nuclear a 'blended issue' – both a technical and a 'morality policy' issue (Braun and Jörgens, 2013)**
- **technology/science shape debates, policies, responses, outcomes ... and vice versa**



# Overarching questions

- What are the social, political and ethical implications of current developments in nuclear energy?
  - How are socio-technical systems and practices at different scales interlinked in these developments?
  - How are the socio-political implications enmeshed in technological processes and change – and vice-versa?
    - e.g. the thorium pathway in India, the fusion dream...?
- ... and more?

# A material framing – the nuclear fuel cycle



- 'nuclear' is complex and extended in space and time
- cycle provides a framework – forces attention to less-studied aspects
- suggests a potentially large research programme


# Key ideas 2: the academic context

- Existing STS research on 'civil nuclear' is limited
  - most existing (recent) STS centres on weapons and disasters
- Social science on 'civil nuclear' dominated by policy studies, cultural geography and social psychology - focus on risk:
  - legitimacy (involvement in decision-making on siting processes)
  - public understanding of (and engagement with) technological risk
- Philosophy: principally focuses on ethics (especially future generations and long-lived nature of waste)

# Key ideas 3: initial conceptual tools


Scales: multiple, overlapping, interlinked

- constructed, contested, and 'do work'
- temporal (low-carbon transition vs. (de)construction vs. long term waste storage)
- spatial (from atomic to global – and risk/policy concerned with scalar containment)
- governance - local...national...supranational



# Key ideas 3: initial conceptual tools

- 'Nuclearism' (Irwin et al. ) and 'nuclearity' (Hecht)
- Actor-networks
- Boundary work (e.g. Gieryn) (scales again!)





# The PhD projects

- Marika Hietala – Decommissioning cultures
  - Susan Hodgson (Sociological Studies) and Neil Hyatt (Department of Materials Science and Engineering)
- Florian Abraham - Nuclear futures and the politics of scale
  - Matt Watson (Geography) and John Provis (Materials Science and Engineering)
- Caroline McCalman – New nuclear and environmentalism
  - Stephen Connelly (Town and Regional Planning) and Russell Hand (Materials Science and Engineering)
  - and Matthew Cotton (Town & Regional Planning)



# *Decommissioning Cultures: The policy and practice of waste management*

Marika Hietala

- Approach: compare real-time decommissioning process, policy and practice in the UK & Finland. Actor-network approaches adopted to analyse nuclear waste disposal and storage innovations as socio-technical issues.
- Context:
  - UK: committed to deep geological disposal of nuclear wastes & to local voluntarism in the siting process – renewed process in 2014 following a failure in west Cumbria
  - Finland : waste repository site already selected
- Research questions:
  - do national cultural and political contexts influence attitudes and concerns regarding the technological aspects of nuclear waste disposal?
  - how are nuclear waste and deep geological disposal framed in the two countries, and what has shaped these framings over time?
  - can the policy desire to reach a broad public acceptance exist successfully with technological demands and desires



# *Nuclear futures and the politics of scale*

## Florian Abraham

### Context:

- The UK government is currently developing nuclear power plant projects
- There is still little evidence of how commitment to nuclear power contributes to path dependencies in energy system innovation and development

### Research questions:

- Can we rely once again on a resource based technology? (Uranium depletion)
- What are the social costs and benefits of nuclear energy? (For communities surrounding uranium mines, nuclear plants and disposal sites).
- How is the notion of “scale” embedded in the governance?
- What are the consequences of nuclear energy development for sociotechnical energy systems? What are the implications for alternative technologies?



# *New nuclear, new environmentalisms*

## Caroline McCalman

### Context:

- the longstanding precariousness of nuclear power in the public psyche (destruction vs. production)
  - traditional environmentalist opposition, successful in influencing public opinion – changing under impact of climate change agenda
  - rise of the new 'common sense nuclearism'
- questions about expertise, risk, and change/stability in these

### Research questions:

- do environmentalists' opinions affect the public?
  - to what extent are people aware of splits in environmental opinion?
- are there 'generational' effects? How malleable are they?
- (how) has the public's new 'reluctant acceptance' (Bickerstaff et al. 2008) changed, post-Fukushima?

Mixed qualitative methods, with a focus on discourse analysis

# Ways of working

- Social science base - the projects will produce *social science knowledge*

but

- Multi-disciplinary
  - problems conceived across sociological and technical concerns
  - students taking STS and engineering training modules
  - students form a social science cohort that will engage with a nuclear engineering cohort over the 4 years of the projects.
- PhD Network structure - a kind of 'research group' structure: peer group meetings; individual supervisor meetings; network meetings.
- Other networks: access to supervisors' networks; industry links; other colleagues' networks (e.g. SEAS research groups)...and more from here in Lisboa?



# Currently foreseen questions:

- What might collaboration actually mean as a day-to-day practice? (By students, by supervisors...)
- How can (inter)disciplinarity be maintained? (The creative experiment does not 'fit' with university structures)
- What ethical issues may arise...?
  - ...from STS engagements with nuclear engineering?
  - ...from critical engagement with 'nuclearism'?
  - ...from (competing/clashing) normative/moral/political positions?
- Through STS do we lose sight of (ecological) environmental issues and concerns?

# What are the unknown unknowns?

